

*Light in a Candlestick, to all that are
in the House: Or,*

THE
Impartial Churchman,

CONSIDERING

The Celebrated Discourses on the 30th
of *January*,¹⁷³⁰ of the Right Reverend the *W^m Brasen*
Bishop of *Bristol*, before the House of
Lords; of the Reverend Dr. *Samuel Croxall*,¹⁷³⁰ *th*
before the House of Commons; and of *Prov 25.5*
the Reverend Dr. *Trap*, before the Lord
Mayor, and Court of Aldermen.¹⁷³⁰ *Luk 23.20*

WHEREIN,

With a just Praise of their Merits, Respect
to their Characters, and Deference to the
Church; their Matter, Method, Explanations
of, and Deductions from Scripture, are observ'd.
especially as to Dr. *Trap*'s Notion of visiting the
Sins of the Fathers on the Children.

WITH

Readings in the *Hebrew, Chaldee, Arabick, and
Vulgate*, noted: And to take in what is most remarkable
on this Head, a Reflection on a Principle of the Right
Reverend the Bishop of *Salum*, and the Dispute of *Milton*
and *Salmasius*, Mr. *Milbourn* and Mr. *Bradbury*: With a
Rule to judge and apply all Sermons on that deplorable
Occasion.

[John]
By *J. HENLET, M. A.* *R*
Founder of the ORATORY.

LONDON:

Printed for J. ROBERTS, near the Oxford-Arms in
Warwick-Lane. MDCCLXXX. [Price Six-pence.]





EXOD. xxv. 31, 32.

— Thou shalt make a Candlestick of pure Gold ; of beaten Work shall the Candlestick be made ; his Shaft and his Branches, his Bowls, his Knops, and his Flowers shall be of the same : And six Branches shall come out of the Sides of it, three Branches of the Candlestick out of the one Side, and three Branches of the Candlestick out of the other Side.



WHATEVER was written aforetime, was written for our Instruction, that we thro' Patience and Comfort of the Scriptures, might have Hope : What God has cleansed, that call not thou common : What the DIVINE SPIRIT, the Oracle of Sacred Scripture, has been
A pleas'd

pleas'd to dwell upon in a particular Manner, that *call not thou* unworthy of thy serious Attention; *Despise not Prophecying*, and *lean not too much to thine own Wisdom*: *What can be more mean*, and ought to be more humble, than *Man that is a Worm*, and the *Son of Man*, that is a *Worm*? The best are only *Vessels* fashion'd out of the same Lump by the Hand of the Potter; and it is God, who sheweth Mercy, not Man, lest he should boast, that hath made some to honour, and others to dishonour.

The Lord himself, (according to whose Pattern in the Mount, a Figure of good Things to come, Moses fram'd the Tabernacle, and the holy Things of the Sanctuary) condescended to the Infirmities of his People, by appointing the most minute Circumstances of the *Jewish Law*; the six Branches and Ornaments of the Golden Candlestick, to teach us, that his Word is our Supreme Law, that nothing is trivial or abject, which he ordains; that the Lord's Testimony is the Light of our Paths; that Doubts are to be search'd, and Obscurities clear'd by the Lamp of Heavenly Intelligence; that he, who is *the Lustre of Israel*, and turneth the *Shadow of Death into the Morning*, is our *Star in the East*, pointing out where we are to offer *the Myrrh* of our Submission, *the Gold* of our peculiar Vows,

Vows, and *the Incense* of our Devout Acknowledgment.

This was the Original of St. *John's* Vision of the Son of Man, *Rev. i. 13, 20.* in the midst of the Seven Candlesticks, which were the Churches; for the Lamps were seven, He the Centre, from whom the six Branches were illuminated; not mention'd here by *Moses*, because *the Sun of Righteousness was not yet arisen with Healing in his Wings*: Therefore at first the Mediation-Lamp was not spoken of; *the Branch of Jesse*, call'd emphatically, *the Man, the Branch*, was not enumerated among the rest, till *the Veil should be taken away*, and the Glory over the Mercy-Seat should become *a Light to lighten the Gentiles*, as well as the Splendor of the Sons of *Jacob*, the universal SHECHINAH of Mankind.

The Prophet *Zechariah* mentions this Candlestick, with the two Olive-Trees on each Side, to instruct us, that *the Wisdom which is from above is first pure, then peaceable*: The Golden Materials are *the Truth of the most High*, in the Scripture, directing and opening the Way of the Just to a perfect Day; the beaten Work is the repeated Meditation of Man on the same Argument; the Knops and Flowers are the Divisions and Embellishments, by every holy *Bezaleel*, each Spiritual Workman, rightly

dividing the Word of Truth ; the six Branches are the Principal Lights, that extend equally their Force to all, tho' on opposite Sides of the same Candlestick ; and the seventh is the *Son of God*, not to be mention'd with the Inferior Branches ; but the Standard and Fountain of all Knowledge ; whose Words are *as fine Gold, more precious, as Silver try'd seven Times in the Furnace* ; and *who shall sit to purify the Sons of Levi, as a Refiner of Gold and Silver.*

In the mean time, till his final Judgment, till he shall be the *Light and Sun of that City*, into which the *Kings of the Earth, those who have been made to him Kings and Priests*, shall bring their Glory ; Let us consider those *Sons of Levi*, those main Branches of the same Candlestick, Subjects of one and the same Nation, Professors or Teachers of the same Common Christianity, as to their various Sentiments, and Model of discoursing on the Unhappy Occasion of the Thirtieth of *January* ; to weigh the beaten Gold in the Balance of the Sanctuary, and kindle the Sacred Fire, like *Elijah*, by a Ray from Heaven, unpolluted by the Smoke of the nether Furnace, where their Belief is trembling, and their Light is outer Darkness.

Be the two Right Reverend Bishops of *Bristol* and *Sarum*, the two first Branches, like *Olive-trees*, as they should be the Ministers of Peace, on either Hand of the *Son of Man*.

The Scheme of the Bishop of *Bristol* begins with a Text from *Rom. xiii. 5.* *Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for Wrath, but also for Conscience-sake: That is, because the Powers that be are ordain'd of God: Though the Bishop does not there explain what is meant by the Powers that be, whether the King only, or King, Lords and Commons, or Lords and Commons without the King, (a famous Case of which is well-known,) or any Powers that be, for the Time being. His Lordship should have divided the Word to us, on that Head, according to the Example of Christ, *Apollo*, and *St. Paul*, who expounded the Scriptures, that those Things were so; and left all Pastors a Rule to be mighty in them. This is one Defect in any Schemes of the 30th of *January* Sermons, to preach on a Text, without explaining the Terms of that and the Context, by which we are undirected as to our own Conscience and Practice in the Application of the Sermon; as the Bishop very well urges *Conscience*, and *Conscientiously*, *Pag. 6.* but unless he had told us the*

Mean-

Meaning of the *Powers that be*, how can we be *Conscientious* of our Duty to them?

The Right Reverend the Bishop of *Sarum* has written many Books, and preach'd many Sermons to shew, that " it is the " Civil Magistrate's being the Minister of " God to us FOR GOOD," that is the Measure of our *Consciences* in applying St. *Paul's* Rule; by which that Bishop makes the People Judges of their Consciences in that Particular, and Judges of *Him*, how far he is the Minister of God *for Good*; which is giving them a Judicature, a Judgment of THE MINISTRY of the Civil Magistrate. Now these two Bishops, who are opposite Lights on the same Candlestick, should both give the People a determinate Rule of Conscience on this Point; otherwise the word Conscience, will be us'd at Large, as it has been; and the Bishop of *Sarum's* Conscience will be no Law to the Bishop of *Bristol*, nor either of them to the Consciences of others. I remark it therefore as the second Defect in the 30th of *January* Sermons, not to give the People a distinct Rule of Conscience to act by, on a Scripture Footing, in this Affair; leaving, by that Omission, a Latitude for two Consciences, different and repugnant to each other, and therefore, for two Thousand, or more, indefinitely.

The

The Bishop of *Bristol* proceeds, *Pag.* 7, 8, and 9. to rehearse the personal Virtues of his Majesty King *Charles* the First, that he was a Gracious, Merciful, and Pious King; *Pag.* 9. he professes not to enter into the Causes of the Rebellion. Truth can never suffer, and the whole Truth might have been gloriously laid forth on the Panegyrick before; for half the Truth is not the whole: I remark it as a third Defect, not to exhibit to us the main of the *entire Question*; for how can a Christian's Conscience be fully inform'd, by letting him only into a part of his Information? And how can the People rightly discharge their Obligation, if their Consciences be not compleatly instructed?

Pag. 11. The Bishop of *Bristol*, instead of looking back, would prevent the like Calamities for the future, not by explaining the Scripture, regulating surely, and fully informing the Conscience, but by *his own Use* of the Text; shewing from that, 1. That a conscientious Regard to the Principles of Religion, is the firmest Support of Civil Government.

Pag. 5. He shew'd first from the Text, "The Duty of Subjection from God's ordaining the Powers that be:"

Pag. 11. He has a Second First, "To shew the Support of Government from
" the

“ the Principles of Religion in general,” which is neither in the Words, nor in the Sense of the Text: The single Duty of Subjection for Conscience Sake, is not a *conscientious* *Regard to the Principles of Religion at large for the Support of Government*: That is Conscience *for the sake of the Government*; the Text is *Subjection for the sake of Conscience*; which is the direct contrary: For Conscience, in the Text, is the Rule of Subjection to Government for its firmest Support, not the Support of Government the Rule of Conscience.

His first Head is shewn indeed, as he speaks, *from the Text*, because it is not *in it*. The Text does not guide him to compare what is more or less for the Support of Government, but it gives two Motives of Subjection, one for Wrath, the other for Conscience, in regard to Obedience only, without the least Handle to compare them, for the Support of Government. There is not a Word in the whole Chapter of the Support of Government, which is a distinct Idea, another Proposition, from that of Subjection for the sake of Conscience. That Support might have been made a remote Inference, it could not naturally and immediately be made the first Head from the Text; the first Head ought not to be of what may be thought imply'd

ply'd in a Text, but of what is there immediately; otherwise it denies any Head to be first, by making any to be equally so. *St. Paul* makes no Comparison, the Bishop does; *and shews it from his Words*: *St. Paul* speaks of Subjection for the sake of Conscience; the Bishop of Conscience, or religious Principles, for the sake of Government: One says, you ought to be subject, as you are conscious, the Magistrate is the Minister of God for Good to you; the other, you ought to be a Man of Conscience and Religion, because it is the firmest Support of Government; which inverts the Proposition; for that Reason is *not Conscience*, being only a *human Motive*, and govern'd by a temporal Consideration.

I remark it as a fourth Defect in the 30th of *January* Sermons, to shew from the Words of the Text in the first Head, what is not in the Words at all, and if suppos'd to be imply'd, must have come under a more distant Article: Unless *my Lord Bishop* had an Eye to that Passage, *the first shall be last, and the last first; for many are call'd, but few are chosen.*

From *Pag. 12*, to 23, which is the Body of the Sermon, the Bishop of *Bristol* enlarges on this first Head (leading him still farther out of the way, the longer he follow'd a wrong Path at setting out) about

B

the

the Rise of Government, “ from Violations of the Laws of Nature, by the Consent of Men only; no Form of Government, as he says, *Pag.* 16. being prescrib’d by God above another. He is enforcing Obedience from Conscience, and yet he tells us, God does not prescribe any Government at all more than another; by which he puts Conscience out of the Question: So that he makes Religion the firmest Support of Government, and yet affirms it has not the Support of Religion, it is not founded upon that, but on breaches of the Laws of Nature, and is a meer human Institution. Conscience to God for a human Institution, and from secular Motives for the Peace and Order of Society, is a Contradiction in Terms; it is not *St. Paul’s Doctrine*. *St. Paul* says we are to be subject, as we are conscious the Magistrate is the Minister of God to us for Good. That was *St. Paul’s Conscience*; he did not make the Interest, or firmest Support of the Government, *his Conscience*, his God; his Persuasion of the Powers being the Minister of God to him for Good, was the Rule of his Conscience.

Pag. 23. The Bishop of *Bristol* proceeds, “ That THIS LEADS him to his second “ Head;” *Pag.* 12. he was to shew *all three Heads from the Words of the Text*, and the
second

second is, " that the Christian Religion
 " lays the strongest Obligation of Obedi-
 " ence on the Consciences of all Christi-
 " ans:" This is true, but not in the Text:
 It might have been also a remote Inference,
 but more properly a fifth, than a second
 Head; for that ought to have been, what *in*
the Words is the second Consideration.

He tells us here, that the Christian Re-
 ligion lays us under the strongest Ties of
 Subjection to Government; whereas before
 he told us, that Government was founded
 on human Consent, not God's Appoint-
 ment: Subjects are Subjects to a Form of
 Government; no Form of it, says the Bi-
 shop, is prescrib'd by God, nor therefore by
 the Christian Religion, above another; yet
 he insists, you are to be *subject* to a *Form of*
Government, for Conscience Sake, by applying
 it at last to the present Government. His
 Discourse is a proper Image of the Rebel-
 lion, it fights with it self: God orders you
 to be subject to a Form of Government; yet
 God, he avers, order'd no Form of it, Man
 order'd the whole.

Pag. 24. He builds the Right of the Ma-
 gistrate to Tribute, and the Obligation of
 others to pay it, on Christ's Answer to
 the Question, *Matth. xxii. 16. Whether it*
was lawful to pay Tribute? Observe, the
 Question is not, whether a Man was *oblig'd*

to pay it, but whether it was even so much as *lawful*; Christ did not say it was *lawful*, or a *Duty to pay Tribute*, but in general Terms, *Render to Cæsar the Things that are Cæsar's*? What Things are Cæsar's? Christ did not resolve that Question. In another Text Christ said, *the Children are free from Custom or Tribute*. The Bishop quotes St. Paul as an Example of Subjection, Pag. 25. St. Paul would not submit once to the Magistrate, *Is it lawful, says he, for you to scourge a Man that is a Roman, and uncon-*
denn'd?

Pag. 27. He comes to his Third and last Head, That it is our Duty to be subject to the present Government. Pag. 11. he expresses it, *how much* it is our Duty; and he proposes there to shew that from the Words of the Text, that is, the Bishop asserts, that St. Paul, near 1700 Years ago, (though no Form of Government, as he declares, was ever prescrib'd by God above another,) made it our Duty to God, for Conscience Sake, to be subject to the *present Government*. His Expression, *How much*, Pag. 11. was his Guide. He concludes with an Encomium upon His Majesty, the Royal Family, and the Blessings of the present Situation of Affairs; all *shewn from the Words of the Text*,

I remark, that the Scheme of the Bishop's Sermon was to celebrate the present Government, and to turn his Text and Sermon to that Point; whereas his Text should have been, as he propos'd, the Fountain of his Discourse; he has made the Conclusion of the Discourse the Beginning of the Text, and has put St. Paul's Words IN SUBJECTION to his own Speculations.

That of the Reverend Dr. ^(Cromwell) Croxall claims our next Attention: His Text is, "Take away the Wicked from before the King, and his Throne shall be establish'd in Righteousness." The Doctor professes, p. 6. to chuse these Words, because they *may not be found improper* to a Scheme he had form'd before he chose his Text, to shew the Agreement of the 5th of November, which commemorates our Deliverance from Popery and Slavery, (*the Doctor supposing we are deliver'd from Slavery,*) with the 30th of January, appointed to implore God's Pardon for the Martyrdom of King Charles the First. This teaching us, that the Persons of Kings are inviolable; the other, that something should be done, when they are oppressive; not upon their own Persons, but *Taking the Wicked from before Him*. That Doctrine, of the Persons of Kings being inviolable, the Doctor finds *strongly imply'd in his Text*; and he adds Reasons for

prev
38.5

for it, from the Dignity of their Office; declaring Kings to be Officers: From the Cares and Ills they are subject to; from the Obligation we owe them for accepting so difficult an Employment, declaring that Kings *have an Employment*; from the General Practice, that, in the worst of Cases, the Persons of Kings have been untouch'd. The Doctor does not suppose those Cases to be unknown, and therefore does not mention them.

He proceeds, *p.* 10. to assure us, that among all Nations, Christians, as well as Heathen, Kings have been look'd upon as God's Vicegerents: He supposes the Heathen Instances of that Sentiment to be too familiarly known to require a Mention. He produces St. Paul, as styling Kings *the Ministers of God*: St. Paul speaks of *the Powers that be*, and of *the Minister*, which is, *the Servant*, of God, in that Chapter, not of Kings.

I wou'd not be misunderstood to dislike Dr. Croxall's Sentiments, any more than Dr. Trap's hereafter, but to observe upon their Discourses with that *Enquiry after Truth, which is my singular Profession*. He comments on *the allow'd Meaning* of that Law, *Honour thy Father and Mother*, in this Light; a Meaning may be currently allow'd, and not just; and no Meaning of an

an Old Testament Text ought to be allow'd a *Divine Meaning*, that is, a Religious Doctrine, that is not declar'd to be that precise Meaning in some other Texts of the Old or New Testaments. For the Meanings of Interpreters are various, and disallow'd by others.

Pag. 11. He quotes the Case of *David* at *Hachilah*, abhorring to stretch forth his Hand against the Lord's Anointed, *Saul*, appointed King by a Prophet; *supposing* that Case of *David* to be that of a Nation in regard to a King anointed by a Bishop, or a *Pastor* of the Church, as *Dr. Croxall* styles a Bishop, p. 3. It is remarkable, that the First Book of *Samuel*, c. 8. on the People's asking a King gives a very particular Character of one; and that Book was written by a Prophet, and is call'd *The First Book of Kings*.

Pag. 12. He quotes that Law of *Moses*, *Thou shalt not revile the Gods, nor curse the Ruler of thy People*; it is *Exod. xxii. 28*. But *Israel* had then no Kings, and the Word *אלהים*, Gods, is any Rulers, or Magistrates, or Leaders of a People.

The Doctor has not shewn us here the Difference between reviling Kings, and saying, as he does, p. 5. "That they violate the Initial Compact, substitute their own Wills for the Laws, and pursue Courses opposite to the People's Interest;" for some may

may interpret a just Complaint of iniquitous Facts to be reviling; and they may insist, that if a Ruler of the People is not to be revil'd, then an Administration, tho' Wicked, is not to be call'd Wicked. There shou'd have been a Definition of *reviling*, and a Distinction on the Word, *Rulers of the People*: Let me supply this; To revile is to propagate false Facts instead of true Ones, with Malice prepenſe; or to use opprobrious Language, Words conveying a Reproach, without, or beyond a real Foundation.

To expreſs what we conceive true Facts, in their exact Light, of the Rulers of a People, is not to revile them; but is the Doctrine and Practice of the Bible, eſpecially of the Prophets, St. *John the Baptist*, and Chriſt Himſelf.

The Doctor goes on to his ſecond Head, "To take away the Wicked from before the King;" He ſpeaks of the Commentators, and the *Greek* Verſion of the *Septuagint*, *κτενε ἀσεβεις*, *Kill the Wicked*: The Doctor words it, *Cut off*: He omits to give the *Hebrew* Original *הנו רשע*, *Remove wicked*; it may be, wicked *Thing*, or *Action*, as well as wicked *Man*; the Word is the Singular Number, and is not confin'd to a *Person*; it may be, *Remove Wickedneſs*, *Unrighteouſneſs*: The *Chaldee* Paraphraſe

phrase has it נְהַטְרִיד רְשָׁעִים *Let Wicked be cast out*: The *Arabick* begins this Chapter remarkably thus; In the Name of the Eternal Everlasting God: And before that, it is noted, *The Proverbs of Solomon are ended; his Instructions follow; very difficult to be explain'd; which the Friends of Hezekiah wrote out.*

So likewise the *Syriac* places the End of the *Proverbs of Solomon* before the Beginning of this Chapter: This the Doctor might have observ'd, when he spoke his Text out of the *Proverbs*.

In the *Arabick*, it is the 5th Verse; the *Hebrew*, the Original, is *Remove*; the *Vulgar Latin* is *Aufer*: The Doctor might have remark'd the Original, and other Readings, and the Latitude of the Acceptation.

Pag. 17. He tells us, we ought to enquire who are the *Higher Powers*. Before, *p. 10.* he had said, that *Kings* are the Ministers of God. *P. 17.* he affirms, the *Higher Powers*, which are the same in *St. Paul*, as the Ministers of God, are the Legislative Power, the King, Lords, and Commons; so that here he extends Passive Obedience to the King, Lords and Commons; and they are all according to Him inviolable, by an equal Reason, either among one another, or to the People.

He has omitted to prove, that *St. Paul* means the King, Lords, and Commons, by the *Higher Powers, or the Powers that be*. He, under whom *St. Paul* wrote, was indeed a Tyrant, but *St. Paul* had no Law on his Side; for the Christian Religion then was not legally tolerated in the *Roman Empire*. When *St. Paul* had Law, he pleaded it; witness the Instance produc'd before.

The Doctor tells us, that Kings obstinately persisting in Tyranny should be *civilly disabled* from it: The Word *Civil*, from *Civis*, a Citizen, a Free Subject, imports, that the *Cives*, Citizens, Subjects, may disable him from being a Tyrant; in what manner he is to be civilly disabled, he does not express.

- In a Sermon on the 30th of *January*, an important Doctrine should be built on a fix'd Meaning of a Text, and the Discourse should flow from it. It is an Honour to the Doctor, that being the King's Chaplain, and preaching before the House of Commons, He declar'd his Judgment with so much Spirit and Fortitude, becoming an *Englishman*, a Divine, and a Christian. But it is to me inconsistent, that he meant, by the Wicked, the Chief of the Ministry; because he tells us, that the Legislative, of which

which they are a Part, being Members of the Houses of Lords and Commons, is Inviolable; so that he has left us destitute of a Clue to judge, who or what Wicked are to be removed: *I do not here examine the Truth of his Doctrine, that a Legislative, or Kings, are Inviolable.*

The Reverend Dr. *Trap*, in the *Dedication* of his Sermon, excuses the Severity of his Expressions upon the Day, by the like in an Act of Parliament. He needed not that Excuse for being severe upon it; and they that would dislike his Expressions, would object to those of the Act, for the same Reason. Acts of Parliament may be producible for and against the same Things.

His Text is extremely moving, and adapted to affect the Passions; *Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for your selves, and for your Children.* Tho' King *Charles* the First acquitted the Parliament, and thereby, in his Judgment, the Nation represented by it, of the Guilt of this Fact; tho' many, that acted in Opposition to some of his Measures, protested against this Extremity; yet we know not how far in the secret Counsels of God, who *maketh Inquisition for Blood*, this may be

imputed to the Nation; and therefore it may concern the Nation to deprecate it. I enter not here into the Question, of the Reasons for and against the Abolition of that *Day*; it may be an Immortal Caveat to admonish all of their Duty, from the Throne to the Cottage.

Dr. *Trap*'s Observation is very just, that the King's Concessions gave his Adversaries Power against him.

Pag. 8. He speaks of the King's being his People's *natural* Sovereign; that is, *born their King*; intimating, that *Nature* is an additional Tye to all other Obligations: And he is a *Moral* Sovereign, who observes the Tyes of natural Justice, Equity, and Love, to all his Subjects.

Pag. 9. He repeats the Maxim, that the Person of the King is by our Laws inviolable. The Doctor has not shewn us, how that Rule was kept at the Revolution, as to the Person of *James* the Second at *White-hall*, the Battel of the *Boyne*, and other Junctures, by the Interpreters of our Laws at that Time: And we still want an Adjustment of the Point, as stated by Dr. *Croxall*, how far we may cut off wicked Ministers, and civilly disable a Tyrannical King, without Violence to his Person. For if that be among those
Mini-

Ministers, and Force be lawful for their Removal, that Force may terminate on the King's Person. Therefore he should have instructed us, how making War with the Wicked to take them away from the King, may not be taking the King away at the same Time, and a Violation of his Person. Dr. *Trap* owns that the King's Ministers were Accountable. All Rulers under the King are his Ministers; the Scripture speaks of the same Obedience to all Rulers, *the Powers that be*, without Distinction. If Passive Obedience is due to one, it is due to all; if not to all, then not to any, for the same Reason.

Pag. 9. Dr. *Trap* remarks, that God punishes the Sins of the Fathers on their Posterity in the Scripture; he omits the main Reason of that Oeconomy in the Old Testament, which is, that God was King of the *Jews*, in a temporal Covenant with them and their Children; and could Disseize either by a legal Forfeiture of *his Rights* vested in them, on certain Defaults. They forfeited *his Grants*, not *their own Property*; for no Creature, especially in Covenant, is a Proprietor in Bar of the Creator, who is Lord Supreme. As to any other positive Stipulation of God with the *Jews*, exposing their Children for the Father's Sins, it does not hold out

out of that Nation, and that Covenant; it is not applicable to any other Country.

Pag. 11. The Doctor offers a Reconcilement of the two places of Scripture, *Exod. xx. 5. God visits the Sins of the Fathers upon the Children*; and *Ezek. xviii. 20. The Soul that sinneth, it shall die; the Son shall not bear the Iniquity of the Father*. The Doctor reconciles this, by supposing that *Ezekiel* means the next Life, *When the Soul that sinneth shall die*; that is, be punish'd with the second Death, of eternal Misery.

There is no Contradiction in those Places. *Exod. xx. 5. God visits the Sins of the Fathers upon the Children, to the third and fourth Generation, of those that hate him*; that is, Idolaters were obnoxious to be cut off with Death, to the third and fourth Generation. This was to be by God's Execution of his own Law, as he pleas'd. *The Son shall not bear the Iniquity of the Father*; that is explain'd, *Deut. xxiv. 16. of Man's Execution of God's Law, that he was not to kill the Son for the Father's Sins*.

Consult that Text: *The Fathers shall not be put to Death for the Children, nor the Children for the Fathers: Every Man shall be put to Death for his own Sin*. It is transcrib'd by *Ezekiel*, and means in both a human Execution,

tion, not a divine Visitation. 2 Kings xiv. 6. *The Children of the Murderers he slew not: According to the Law, the Fathers shall not be put to Death for the Children, nor the Children for the Fathers; every Man shall be put to Death for his own Sin: Which is spoke of Joash killing the Servants that slew his Father, and not their Sons; proving that this of Ezekiel refers to human Executions only, as directed in Deuteronomy.*

Another Proof of this is 2 Chron. xxv. 4. where *Amaziah* is said not to slay the Children of Murderers, as the Law commanded, saying, *The Fathers shall not die for the Children, nor the Children for the Fathers, but every Man shall die for his own Sin.* The same as in *Ezekiel*, a human Execution.

And ver. 2. of that Chapter of *Ezekiel*, you read of a popular Complaint, *The Fathers have eaten sowre Grapes, and the Children's Teeth are set on Edge; you shall have, saith the Lord, no more Occasion for that Proverb, —all Souls are mine; the Soul that sinneth, it shall die.* There God repeals the Penalty in *Exodus*, which he threaten'd, *that he would visit the third Generation:* And *Jerem. xxxi. 30.* prophesies, in the very Words of *Ezekiel*, that *the Days shall come,*

come, when every Man shall die for his own Iniquity.

Dr. *Trap* avers, that the only true way of reconciling these Places (which want no Reconcilement but to understand them, that *Ezekiel* repeals the Penalty in *Exodus*, as to any suppos'd divine Visitation on Posterity, and refers to human Executions only, as to a distinct Law of not killing the Sons for the Fathers Sins ;) the Doctor's only true way is by explaining *Ezekiel* of a Future State, which is out of the *Jewish* Covenant, out of their Law, though known to, and believ'd by most of them. *The Children's Teeth* are *set on Edge*; did not mean that the Children dy'd in another World ; but present Inconveniencies, which they complain'd they suffer'd *unequally*, not according to their Law, for their Fathers Sins. Whence God answers them, Are not my Ways equal, just by my Covenant, in your Law? They cou'd not complain of Inequality as to another Life, because it was never stipulated to them ; it was a present Grievance which they then knew and felt, not the Apprehension of one to come.

The Doctor is more just in his History than his Divinity ; he well paints the miserable Consequences of the Civil Wars to this Day ; *P.* 16. he ascribes to them *the most corrupt*

corrupt Religion of King *James II.* as he speaks; the Canon-Law still retain'd in *England*, founded much on the spurious *Isidore*, is Part of that, which is two thirds of another Church, and numerous other Corruptions are producible on a Challenge.

The Doctor puts some Blame on King *Charles* and King *James II.* What Prince is without it? Yet King *Charles II.* encourag'd Learning; Trade was not sunk in his Time, nor Taxes so burthensome. Their Faults ought not, cannot be defended. May we see no greater. And, as the Doctor quotes the Text, *Let the Ministers, the Priests of the Lord, weep between the Porch and Altar;* lest a Share in the Guilt of that Day should be laid to their Charge.

I will not now dwell upon what *Salmasius*, a Great Master of Critical Learning in *France*, has written in Defence of the King in the Civil Wars; or of what *Milton* has reply'd to him; that may be the Matter of another Lecture: It was said, that *Salmasius* dy'd of secret Uneasiness at the Answer of *Milton*.

The Reverend Mr. *Milbourn*, has been distinguish'd for his Zeal, and repeated Discourses on this Subject; and particularly, for his *Preface* against the Reverend Mr. T.

D

Bradbury;

Bradbury; who retorted upon him, *Fenwick*, *Friend*, *Parkins*, *Charnock*, *Rookwood*, *Ashton*, and others, declaring a Design to murder King *William*, as agreeable to Conscience, and the Doctrine of the Church of *England*; and that in the Case of King *Charles*, no *Proof* could be given, when the King would not *plead*. I wou'd remark on that, that a King pleading is not in the Laws of *England*. The Word *Pleas*, is from *Placita*, the King's Sentences or Pleasure; which is against his Pleading.

I will conclude at present with a Method of Judging all Sermons on the 30th of *January*. The first Step is to resolve on forming an entire View of the Occasion. He that is imperfectly acquainted with the History and Foundation of the Original Controversy, which produc'd the Civil Wars, and ended in this fatal and deplorable Event, must have an imperfect Notion of the Discourses preach'd on the Anniversary: If on either Side, for or against it, he is determin'd to judge according to his Passions, and Prejudices, taken for granted, he cannot understand a Sermon on the Subject.

For this Purpose, he is to consult all the Lights of Historians possible, neglecting none of either Party; weighing their Authentickness, their Honesty, their Knowledge

ledge of Persons and Incidents, and building, not upon *their* Opinions, Characters, Representations, and Reflexions, as *theirs*, but as *Facts* vouch'd by them; comparing them with one another, and passing a very slow, deliberate Sentence on the whole Comparifon.

When he has laid this Bottom, a Hearer is to confider, on the 30th of *January*, what is the Audience, what is the known Byafs of the Major Part, what they defire, wifh, or expect, fhall be preach'd, and guard his Judgment on that Quarter: Who is the Preacher, what his Abilities, Study, and Party; what is the Intereft weav'd into the Argument; hear nothing implicitly, for or againft the Day, and attend clofely to the Application of it.

Then when the Text is nam'd, let him reflect, how proper it is to that Point; whether it be explain'd at all, or juftly; whether the Doctrine arifes from it; whether the Heads be regular, branching of themfelves in order from the Propositions of the Text, and one another, or *made* to iffue from it; whether the Proofs be alledg'd for Affertions, from Facts, Witneffes, and Scripture, and taking the Scheme and Tenor of the Difcourfe, the moft probable View and Inclination of the Preacher and the Audience,

with the Reasons and Consequences of them, impartially deduc'd ; and the Share of the present Times in the Affair.

By this Method he will be able to judge clearly the Merits of such Discourses, and separate the Truth from other Mixtures: And as to the pious Turn he is to give to it, he is to make the Scripture his Test; the WORD OF GOD, in the midst of the seven Lamps, his Guide; proportion his Submission to the higher Powers, to their Exercise of their own Duty; enquire how far different Persons intend the same Thing, in several Methods and Circumstances; in the Changes of earthly Kingdoms, look at that Inheritance which fadeth not away; and adore that immortal Potentate, Jesus Christ, who has the Sovereign Right to the Heart, and whose Sceptre is a Sceptre of Righteousness.

I cannot take Leave of this Consideration, without doing Justice to the Virtues of the three Preachers above-mention'd: The Loyalty of the Bishop to his Prince; the Zeal and Vivacity of Dr. *Trap*; the Publick Spirit of Dr. *Croxall*. Let us apply the whole to the Culture and Improvement of all worthy Qualities, which we esteem in others; the Discernment
and

and Cure of our own Defects; our mutual Edification and Good-will, as Fellow-Christians; and modelling this, and all Articles of Thought and Conduct, to our ultimate End, the Salvation of the never-dying Soul, and the Glory of the Eternal King; To whom be all Obedience, Love and Praise, through endless Ages,

FINIS.



(2)

THE OFFICE OF THE
DIRECTOR OF THE
BUREAU OF THE
CENSUS
WASHINGTON, D. C.
JANUARY 1, 1901
TO THE
COMMISSIONER OF THE
GENERAL LAND OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D. C.

25 MAR 58

